**INTERVIEW SUMMARY:** 

The Applicant acknowledges with appreciation Examiner Melody Burch and

Supervisor Robert Siconolfi providing an Examiner Interview on 27 October 2011 with

Applicant's representative Jeff Williams.

Courtesy copies of proposed amendments were sent to Examiner Burch for

review and discussion during the interview. The amendments shown in this response

are not the proposed amendments sent to Examiner Burch. The following amendments

are in accordance to the suggestions of Mr. Siconolfi and Examiner Burch during the

Examiner Interview.

In the Examiner Interview, the claims were discussed in relation to the cited

references found in the present Office Action; specifically, U.S. Patent No. 5,788,372

(Jones) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,535,861 (Young), JP-469423 (JP'423), and U.S.

Patent No. 2,774,553 (Jensen).

During the interview, Mr. Siconolfi suggested adding the limitation of the bypass

passages from Claim 17 into independent Claim 11 to overcome the cited rejections.

Mr. Siconolfi claimed that the prior art uses a single passage; thus rendering it obvious

to a second passage. However Mr. Siconolfi conceded the use of more than 2

passages, as disclosed in the claimed invention, was not obvious in view of the cited

art. Examiner Burch further conceded and suggested adding the limitation of Claim 17

also to independent Claim 20 to overcome the cited rejections.

Agreement was reached that amending independent Claims 11 and 20 to include

the limitations of Claim 17 would overcome the rejections found in the present Office

Action.

Examiner Burch reserved the right to conduct a new search and stated that she

will issue another non-final office action if additional art is found.

Amendment Attorney Docket No. 0837RF-H532-US